

November 3, 1967

Approved For Release 2001/11/01 : CIA-RDP69B00369R000200290077-9

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A 5425

time and again. It is, and it must continue to be, inviolable.

Imagine what this combination—of higher prices and restricted freedom of choice—would do to the consumers we must constantly work to protect: It would hurt the elderly, and those who live on low, and often fixed, incomes.

We would lose thousands of jobs. Exports produce markets for our goods. With those markets cut back, the demand for U.S. goods would shrink, and countless people would be out of work.

Make no mistake about the seriousness of this threat: It is neither idle nor far-fetched.

These bills might pass, for lack of action by concerned consumers. In fairness to the Congressmen who have to make the decisions, what are they supposed to believe, if they hear only from the vocal protectionists and see in the rest of their constituents only apathy and ignorance?

If I may quote Congresswoman Sullivan again, "We"—meaning the Congress—"we're just not getting the word. We're not hearing the facts about the local application of national legislation. We have to dig for this information, and frankly, there isn't time for each of us to do that on every issue. This is one area in which all of your organizations are falling down right now. . . . I am not passing the buck from the Congress; rather, I am trying to find a way for you to pass it back to us in a manner in which we can be prodded or forced into doing our share."

This prodding is up to you. It is more than necessary. It is essential if the voice of the people is to be heard in Government. I hope that you can find time to take up this problem on your agenda at this Assembly. I urge you to make time.

You can help maintain for our consumers the highest standard of living the world has ever seen. Or, you can let time and other nations pass us by. You can let thirty years of progress collapse.

The choice, I think, is all too clear.

Before I close I want to compliment Jake Clayman and Sarah Newman on putting this program together. It was a great job and I am proud to have been part of it.

Thank you.

She Gives Poverty Racket a More Sunny VISTA

SPEECH

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 16, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a truly heartening and revealing story about a VISTA project in the Nashville, Tenn., area appeared in the Minneapolis Star on October 12, and I would like to share it with my distinguished colleagues. One of the young VISTA volunteers discussed in the article is Miss Joyce Hewitt, of Walnut Grove, Minn. As described by the Star's editorial editor, George L. Peterson, Miss Hewitt—known as "Sunny" to her poverty neighborhood friends—is making a meaningful personal contribution to success in the war on poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that many of my colleagues, including those who harbor the notion that antipoverty projects contribute to violence, will take the trouble to read Mr. Peterson's excellent

article, which I insert at this point in the RECORD:

SHE GIVES POVERTY POCKET A MORE SUNNY VISTA

(By George L. Peterson)

NASHVILLE, TENN.—When the Vista girl from Minnesota, clad in a yellow outfit and usual bright smile, rode her Honda to her assignment in a poor Negro suburb last spring the young folks asked her name.

"Joyce Hewitt," she announced.

"It don't fit," one said, and all agreed. Let's call her Sunny."

That not only fit—it stuck. So Sunny she is to 123 admiring Negro families in a pocket of poverty called Providence, just outside Nashville.

The daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Hewitt of rural Walnut Grove, Minn., interrupted her education at the University of Minnesota (psychology and pre-med) to join VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America), domestic counterpart of the Peace Corps. She was sent to Atlanta, Ga., for indoctrination, then on to Nashville.

Soon she was joined in her Providence project by Linda Robinson, a medical secretary on a year's leave from her Philadelphia job with Scott Paper Co. Commuting from Nashville proved a time-consuming chore, so they moved into half of a double bungalow on Alice Road, a rocky path up a steep hill bordered by shacks where women sit on the porch and look into space.

What are the white girls doing in Providence? Teaching people to read and write for one thing. Mr. Gray, at age 76, could do neither. Sunny started tutoring him this summer and now he can make out simple words in his Bible, and write laboriously, "I love Jesus."

The girls prod youngsters—prone to truancy from inadequate neighborhood schools—to catch up with their classmates. Particularly ill-equipped are some of the Negro children thrust suddenly into integrated schools.

Most exciting undertaking for the entire community is a recreational center for which the cement blocks and other materials already have been gathered. Construction is scheduled for next month, mostly with donated labor, and then the activities now crowded into the girls' apartment will have permanent shelter.

Providence startled and warmed me when I spent a day with Sunny and Linda. Of the 123 families, about half have no visible fathers. Yet children abound—up to a dozen per house. Almost no one is on relief. Mothers and older girls work as domestics at \$6 a day. The men are laborers mostly, some skilled in the building trades. A few sell produce on the highway that cuts through the settlement.

Only a couple of the dwellings boast indoor plumbing, and one of these belongs to George Davis. He obviously could afford to live elsewhere but he likes the camaraderie and the rough yet attractive terrain of Providence. He and Sunny and Linda have revived the Providence Progressive Civic Club, which long had planned for the recreational center, then ran out of steam.

Mr. and Mrs. Davis were holding a fish fry to raise funds for the center. Never have I eaten better prepared food—a big slab of fish, hush puppies, French fried potatoes, cole slaw. Price: 65 cents. Davis and the girls figured they had in hand about \$400 of the \$1,500 cash needed for the wiring, plumbing and other items for the new building.

Somebody in Nashville suggested that federal funds could be found for the structure. "Nothing doing," said the club officials. The people of Providence want a stake in the center. "Then we'll be more likely to keep things going when Sunny and Linda leave," Davis explained.

The girls are gathering books for the

center. The Nashville Metropolitan Action Committee, sponsors of Sunny and Linda, will provide various programs there. "We'll need a birth control clinic," Davis told me.

That's apparent. The illegitimacy rate must be close to 50 per cent. The great fear of high school girls, and of many of the older women, is pregnancy.

Yet for all the promiscuity, Providence is a conservative, church-going community. Sunny and Linda were accepted wholeheartedly once they proved they had no connection with any Black Power movement, for above all else Providence wants peace. The place is a strange combination of pride and poverty, of hospitality and ignorance, of laughter and tears.

Do Sunny and Linda feel safe in this environment? They frequently are asked. "Never felt so well protected," they answer, almost in unison.

Men in the neighborhood have pledged guardianship. The only hint of trouble came when some white youths drove up tortuous Alice Road looking for "those Vista girls." The Negro youths soon edged them out of Providence, peacefully but firmly.

Sunny and Linda's main concern is the eventual day they must leave Providence, for the ties are strong. After only a day, I could share their sense of attachment.

Representative Charles H. Wilson Makes Some Observations on the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, November 2, 1967, my good friend and colleague from the congressional district adjacent to my own, the gentleman from California [Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON], spoke before the Biological, Chemical, and Nuclear Division of the American Ordnance Association, at a conference held at Andrews Air Force Base, Md.

The speech was well received as a thought-provoking statement of Mr. WILSON's views on this vital subject.

I include the text of Mr. Wilson's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE MIDDLE EAST

(Speech of Hon. CHARLES H. WILSON before the American Ordnance Association, Andrews Air Force Base, November 2, 1967)

I'm very pleased and honored for the opportunity to speak to you this evening. If I may I'd like to discuss my recent trip to the Middle East and perhaps raise some larger foreign policy questions.

As members of the American Ordnance Association—an organization dedicated to military preparedness—you probably share my interest in United States foreign policy. Military preparedness must continue to be one of the main pillars of our foreign policy, and to deny that the two are intimately related is just about as ridiculous as denying that the armament industry is today an integral part of our Nation's economy.

I suppose you've heard the joke that claims the only reason the Israelis didn't capture Cairo and Damascus is because they were renting their tanks by the day and by the mile. Actually Israel's victory was right out of a military science textbook. Her classic pincer movements into Sinai and her superb

November 3, 1967

application of air power have drastically altered the balance of power in this region so vital to our national security.

With the advantage of hindsight, President Nasser's blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba was a daring attempt to reassert his leadership over the badly fractured Arab world. When Nasser sealed off the gulf, one prominent commentator, Joseph C. Harsh of the *Christian Science Monitor*, remarked that "seldom in the history of diplomacy has one man chosen his moment for revenge so skillfully." In one respect Mr. Harsh was correct: the United States was in no position to intervene militarily. But what Mr. Harsh did not and could not know was that at that very same moment the Israeli general staff, alarmed more by the massing of Egyptian troops in Sinai than by the naval blockade, was planning a massive, preemptive strike against the U.A.R. Nasser's rhetoric was soon replaced by the thunder of Israel's fighter-bombers. In retrospect, then, Gamal Abdel Nasser overplayed his hand. He sought a modest political victory, but wound up suffering a total military defeat.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I was one of the first Members of Congress to visit Israel after the war. Arriving in Tel Aviv during the first week of September, I conferred with Israeli and American officials and toured the battle areas, including the Golon Heights the Syrian outpost of Kuneitra, the Gaza Strip, and Israeli-occupied Jordan. If I were asked to recall one central, lasting impression of my trip, I would say that it is the remarkable spirit of the Israeli people. It is hard for Americans, protected as we are by the vast oceans and flanked only by friendly and cooperative neighbors, to imagine a situation in which one's homeland is faced with the prospect of extinction. Yet this was precisely what the Jews were confronted with: A choice between survival and death.

I'd like to make some personal observations on what I saw in Israel and in those areas she now occupies.

At an Army salvage base near Tel Aviv, I inspected captured trucks, tanks, and other materiel. Surprisingly, the instruction booklets for these weapons were in Russian, Czech, or Polish rather than in Arabic, as you would expect. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why the Arabs could not really operate the sophisticated weaponry supplied by the Soviet Union and other Communist countries. In this connection, Alfred Friendly of the *Washington Post* reported that during the battle for the Golon Heights in Syria, he overheard the artillery fire-control officer giving orders in Russian.

The Israeli salvage base commander showed me a Czech-made Arab truck called the "Tazra" which he described as a valuable heavy-duty transport vehicle. The truck was made in Czechoslovakia, but I was shocked to learn that the air filters over each of the front wheels were manufactured by an American company. It would serve no useful purpose to identify the firm, but I have privately expressed my concern about this matter to the State Department.

The Israelis told me that this was only one of many such salvage camps. If the one I saw was fairly typical, they must have captured an enormous quantity of Russian-made weapons. This particular camp had acres and acres of vehicles and guns. One Israeli colonel told me that the Arabs apparently abandoned much of their modern equipment because of a lack of proper maintenance. Many of the vehicles, including the tanks, were captured with only about 500 miles on them, which indicated that as soon as the first minor maintenance was required, they were abandoned. The Israelis put most of the equipment into running condition and covered the necessary parts with cosmoline to preserve them.

The roads throughout Israel, including those in what was formerly Syrian and Jordanian territory, were in remarkably good condition. It appeared that Israel's first task after the war was the resumption of normal transportation and communication. In addition to repairing blown bridges and the like, the Israelis were quickly resurfacing and laying new hard-surface roads throughout Israel and into Jordan and Syria.

The attitude of the Israelis throughout the country, and particularly in the *kibbutzim*, their collective farms, was one of determination to rebuild and, at the same time, one of vigilance.

I suppose that Israeli sacrifices during and after the recent war are relatively minor when viewed against the tragic mural of Jewish suffering in Europe. For these Jews, many of whom are survivors of Nazi death camps, Israel means everything. Yet despite the constant Arab threat, the Israelis remain cheerful and confident of their ability to endure and flourish.

But the most disturbing aspect of the Arab-Israeli war is that American weapons were used against Israel, our only true friend in the Middle East. It can be argued, I think, that our State Department's policy of supplying vast quantities of military aid to the Arabs—while restricting arms sales to Israel—contributed to the outbreak of hostilities.

In my view, we have been suckered into providing massive military aid to Jordan. According to the *New York Times*, American dollars have permitted King Hussein—who just three weeks ago was in Moscow soliciting Soviet aid—to increase his army from 4,000 men in 1948 to some 55,000 today. Thanks to American largesse, Hussein now has a \$56 million defense budget and before the war had eleven infantry brigades five fighter squadrons and approximately 300 modern tanks (250 of which were American-made Patton T-48's).

Our policy of giving military aid to Jordan was based on the naive belief that we could woo Hussein away from the Arab orbit and away from the Soviet Union. This line of reasoning so dearly held in foggy bottom, collapsed during the war. When the chips were down, Jordan declared war on Israel and severed diplomatic relations with us. Americans had to watch the spectacle of Jordan, armed to the teeth with American weapons, waging war against our only ally in the Middle East. Jordan's Patton tanks went up in flames, and so did U.S. foreign policy.

Our Middle East policy turned out to be little more than a State Department pipe-dream. But what worries me is not our Middle East policy per se, but rather the assumptions, the philosophy, and the strategy upon which that abortive policy was based. I am beginning to wonder whether our policy toward the Arab States isn't just a symptom of a more general and more dangerous illness which, if left unchecked, may sap our Nation's vitality at home and diminish our influence abroad.

The British historian, Sir Denis Brogan, has called this illness "the illusion of American omnipotence." By this he means that we Americans believe that if we put our minds to it, we can do almost anything we want internationally. Our agonizing experience in Vietnam has already put that notion to rest. The inescapable fact is that the United States, the most powerful nation on this planet, wields very little political influence in Southeast Asia despite our unlimited military capability. Our political leverage in Saigon, let alone in Hanoi, is very, very limited.

Perhaps a better word for this illness I am trying to diagnose is "globalism." By this I mean the doctrine, best enunciated by the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, and the present Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, that says the United States must intervene every time the virtue of any non-Communist country is threatened by revo-

lution or aggression. According to the "Rusk doctrine," as one columnist has called it, the United States must unilaterally stop aggression and revolution wherever they occur.

I do not pretend to be a foreign policy expert, but it seems to me that Mr. Rusk's globalism of the 1960's is as dangerous as the isolationism of the 1930's, and that indiscriminate internationalism is as foolish as indiscriminate withdrawal into a "fortress America."

There are, I think, some obvious similarities between globalism and isolationism. Both deny the existence of priorities in foreign policy which are derived from a hierarchy of interests and the availability of resources to support them. For both extremes, it is either all or nothing, either total involvement or total abstention. Isolationists used to say, "America will be corrupted by foreign affairs;" globalists are now saying, "American must intervene whenever there is revolution or aggression anywhere." Whereas the isolationists used to say, "we don't need to have anything to do with the world." The globalists are saying, "we shall take on the whole world." You might say, as one historian has, that "isolationism is a kind of introverted globalism, and globalism is a kind of isolationism turned inside out." In other words, Dean Rusk is as far off base as were Colonel Charles Lindbergh and the American firsters.

Both of these worldviews are blind to reality and contrary to America's best interests. Both are based on moral crusades; the isolationists wanted to protect America's virginity, while the globalists are obsessed with communism.

I would hope that we Americans are not so unsophisticated that we would build our whole foreign policy on anti-communism. Yet this is exactly what we have done and seem bent on continuing. At one time this approach made good sense. During the Truman administration communism was monolithic in nature and was, in Dean Acheson's phrase, "The spearhead of Russian imperialism."

But today there are as many different brands of communism as there are people in this room. Communism today is riddled with internal arguments and even open conflicts. The titanic struggle between Communist China and the Soviet Union proves, I think, that national interest is more important than ideology in foreign relations. To paraphrase an old song title, today's Communist might say that "nationalism is breaking up that old gang of mine." Although national communism is far from dead, international communism probably is dead.

Knee-jerk anti-communism yields few returns and is often counter-productive. John Foster Dulles' brainchildren, the Bagdad Pact and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, have proved to be utterly worthless pieces of paper. And blind anti-communism can also be somewhat embarrassing to a nation that claims to stand for such things as freedom, self-determination, and social justice. How do we square these lofty pronouncements with our support for the Diems, the Francos, and the Batistas? Or do the Greek fascists now in power in Athens deserve our support simply because they are anti-Communist?

During the Kennedy Administration there was a recognition that we should be more selective in our foreign relations. John Foster Dulles' crusade was replaced by a more discerning and more flexible assessment of our vital interests.

Yet today Secretary Rusk and other administration spokesmen are riding and spreading the alarm about something they call "Asian Communism," as if there were a single, all-consuming dragon which threatens to engulf Asia as nazism engulfed Europe. However I, for one, am not quite sure whether Mr. Rusk is referring to Vietnamese communism, Japanese communism, Indian commu-

nism, Chinese communism, Indonesian communism, North Korean communism, or the other varieties of communism in that part of the world. Is Mr. Rusk saying that it is America's responsibility to save Asia from a fate Asian nations themselves are not alarmed about?

I have generally supported our policy in Vietnam and will continue to do so. But Secretary Rusk would be well advised, I think, not to raise the spectre of Asian communism or to commit this Nation to a larger war. In this regard I fully agree with Senator Hartke of Indiana, who last week warned that we should not embark on such a crusade unless there is more of a consensus on our policy toward Asia.

A foreign policy which is based primarily on anti-communism confuses the moral crusade with national interest. And more often than not, such a policy is self-defeating. A foreign policy which would oppose revolution throughout the world violates the traditional criteria of national interest and available power. It also violates three basic axioms of foreign policy.

First, the human and material resources of even the most powerful nation are limited. Perhaps we could intervene in two or three small countries simultaneously. But military estimates that we may have to send as many as one million American boys to Vietnam vividly illustrates my point. No nation can afford globalism and unlimited commitments.

Second, trying to suppress revolution in this poverty-ridden world of ours is like trying to suppress waves in the ocean. You crush communism in Vietnam and it raises its head, say, in Thailand; you stop it in the Dominican Republic and it raises its head in Bolivia; and so on. *Putting down a revolution in one part of the world does not prevent revolutions from occurring in other parts of the world.* Assuming that the conditions for revolution are there. No one would deny that the Chinese and the Russians try to seize control of revolutionary movements, but the United States cannot afford to oppose revolutions simply because there are Communists in them. Lest we forget, America was born of revolution. And ours was a violent revolution.

Third, suppressing a revolution in one part of the world is bound to affect one's relations with the rest of the world. Our policy in Southeast Asia has not only damaged our relations with our adversaries, but with neutralist countries and our allies as well. In many ways our intervention in Vietnam—and this is not to say that we should not have intervened there—has isolated the United States internationally. I sincerely hope that when historians look back upon the Vietnam war they will conclude that the gains far outweighed the sacrifices in treasure and blood.

I am neither a hawk nor a dove. I am neither a militarist nor a pacifist. My concern is that our foreign policy be grounded not on the shifting sands of emotion, but rather on the hard bedrock of national interest, and that our foreign policy strengthen America, not weaken us at home and disgrace us abroad.

I think that there is, however, a middle course between globalism and isolationism. I think we must be much more selective in pledging our support to other countries. Let me return to the Middle East problem to illustrate what I mean.

Even though the Arab-Israeli war demonstrated the utter bankruptcy of our Middle East policy, the State Department has quietly

resumed arms shipments to the Arabs. It's amusing that Secretary Rusk, whose favorite word these days is "aggression," hasn't said anything about Arab aggression against Israel. His department still seems to think that if we pour enough money into the Arab countries we can lure them away from Moscow.

I would suggest that if we don't wake up to the simple fact that Israel is our only friend in the Middle East, we soon won't have any friends there at all. Our "one-foot-in-each-boat" policy can only end in disaster for the United States.

In addition to being more selective in committing our power and prestige, I think we must revise our attitude toward revolution.

I believe that rather than opposing revolutions we should compete with the Russians and the Chinese for the control of these revolutions. As I have already explained, revolution is a fact of life. Suppressing revolutions by force creates more problems than it solves. By sending American troops to Lower Slobovia to put down a revolution we smother the flames of revolution but we do not extinguish the causes of the fire. And then when the fire breaks out again with even greater ingenuity, our policy leaves us with only one alternative: sending more troops.

Military intervention, although it is sometimes absolutely necessary, is a poor substitute for foreign policy. What is worse, it leaves us wide open to Communist charges that we are counter-revolutionary and that we support the status quo. Now the status quo might sound pretty good to you and me, but maybe we should ask the Bolivian peasant or the Nigerian farmer or the Indian factory worker what the status quo means to them, and how they feel about those countries that support the status quo. After all, these people and hundreds of millions like them are going to have a lot to say about the future of the underdeveloped world.

What I have tried to do here this evening is give you my views on the Middle East and discuss some general questions which have been on my mind. Like most of us here in Washington, I have too many questions and too few answers. However, the questions I've raised here tonight are fundamental. They will have to be resolved if we are to have real national unity. And the best way to achieve that unity is the American way: free and open debate and let the chips fall where they may.

Before I sit down I'd like to put in a plug for some legislation I've introduced which might interest you. My bill, H.R. 13693, would set up an international aeronautical exposition here in the United States in 1970 and every two years thereafter. Patterned after the Paris air show, which I recently had the privilege of attending, this exposition would seek to encourage worldwide interest in American aviation.

Thank you very much.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at \$1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).